

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-2524**

---

NSONSA KISALA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NEXTEL COMMUNICATIONS,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Peter J. Messitte, District Judge. (CA-97-3098-PJM)

---

Submitted: February 24, 2000

Decided: March 1, 2000

---

Before MOTZ and KING, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Nsonsa Kisala, Appellant Pro Se. Ralph Michael Smith, SHAW & ROSENTHAL, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Nsonsa Kisala appeals the district court's order granting the Defendant's motion for attorney's fees. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Kisala v. Nextel Communications, No. CA-97-3098-PJM (D. Md. Oct. 22, 1999).\* We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

\* Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on October 21, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on October 22, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).